



LONG BEACH TERMINAL AREA IMPROVEMENT PROJECT
SUMMARY OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
Why Are Terminal Area Improvements Being Proposed?	1
Where Would the Proposed Improvements Be Located?	1
What Transportation Security Administration (TSA) Activities Occur at the Airport?	2
How Does the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance Influence the Proposed Project and Alternatives?	2
What Would the Proposed Project Include?	4
What Are the Guiding Principles?	5
How Would the Proposed Improvements Look?	5
Have Any Alternatives to the Proposed Project Been Considered?	9
What is the Proposed Construction Schedule?	10
Would the Proposed Project Result in Any Impacts?	11
What Impacts Are Associated with the Optimized Flights Scenario?	11
Would the Proposed Project Yield Any Beneficial Impacts?	24
What Was Determined to Be the Environmentally Superior Alternative?	24
Does Certification of the EIR Signify Approval of the Proposed Project?	24
How Can You Provide Comments on the Proposed Project?	24

TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1 Long Beach Airport Terminal Area Improvement Project Construction Phasing Estimate	10
2 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures	12
3 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures Related to the Optimized Flights Scenario	22

EXHIBITS

Exhibit

Follows Page

1	Generalized Area of Terminal Improvements	1
2	Concept Floor Plan	5
3	View Perspective of Conceptual Design from Air Side.....	6
4	Year 2004 CNEL Contours	20
5	Year 2005 CNEL Contours with 11 Additional Air Carriers and 25 Commuter Flights.....	20
6	Residential Uses Within 65 CNEL Contour (Existing and Future).....	20
7	Schools Within 60 CNEL Contour (Future)	20

Why Are Terminal Area Improvements Being Proposed?

The City of Long Beach (City) is proposing improvements in the Terminal Area at Long Beach Airport (Airport) to better accommodate the minimum number of flights allowed under the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance. The proposed improvements would also:

- Maximize safety and security of passengers, visitors, and tenants by adhering to Transportation Security Administration, FAA, and all applicable State and local standards including the City's fire, building, and safety codes.
- Maintain and enhance the current character of the Airport Terminal Building as a Long Beach Cultural Heritage Landmark by creating an environment in which the design of the new facilities respects the architectural/aesthetic character of the existing Airport Terminal Building.
- Provide an uncomplicated, operationally and energy-efficient, value-driven design within a plan that can be developed in incremental stages.

Long Beach Airport has been in existence since 1923. The existing Airport Terminal Building was built in 1941 for DC-3 aircraft and served approximately 25,000 annual commercial airline passengers. In 1984, a new concourse area and pre-boarding lounge were constructed immediately south of the existing Airport Terminal Building to provide capacity for 15 daily flights, better accessibility for patrons with disabilities, improved mobility in the passenger screening process, and improved ticketing and check-in processing of Airport users. At the time, the Airport was serving approximately 1.1 million annual passengers (MAP). The aircraft were predominately the MD-80 and B737.

By 2003, the number of passengers using the Airport had increased to almost 3.0 MAP. This increase was predominately due to an increase in the number of commercial flights; however, aircraft size and load factors also contributed to the growth in Airport users. Because existing facilities were not adequate to accommodate this level of activity, the Airport constructed a temporary holdroom, a temporary remote parking lot, and a new baggage claim area in 2002. A second temporary holdroom was added in 2003.

Where Would the Proposed Improvements Be Located?

The Proposed Project would occur in the area surrounding the existing Airport Terminal Building, generally between the Gulfstream building (immediately south of the Terminal Building) and the Million Air north ramp lease site (immediately north of the Terminal Building). In addition to the Terminal Building itself, uses within this area include a permanent holdroom, temporary holdrooms, designated areas for security screening of passengers and baggage, baggage claim areas, a parking structure, and surface parking facilities. On the airfield side, uses include aircraft parking spaces for commercial and commuter carriers as well as general aviation tie-downs on the Million Air site. The layout of the existing facilities in the terminal area is provided in Exhibit 1, *Generalized Area of Terminal Improvements*.

The Proposed Project also provides for the potential use of Parcel O (located on Airport property near the intersection of Clark Ave. and Willow St.) as a temporary site for vehicular parking in the short term (during construction). In the long term, Parcel O could be used for general aviation aircraft tie-downs – specifically as a replacement for parking positions at Million Air's north ramp site that would be displaced by the Proposed Project. Parcel O is located on the southern portion of the Airport in the vicinity of Clark Avenue and Willow Street. Currently,

Parcel O is undeveloped. The *Long Beach Airport Development Areas* map identifies Parcel O as a seven-acre area designated for aircraft tie-down and hangars.

What Transportation Security Administration (TSA) Activities Occur at the Airport?

Under federal law, the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) is directly responsible for developing increased air travel security programs. They have developed enhanced screening procedures at airports across the country. Under TSA requirements both passengers and checked baggage are subject to security screening.

TSA currently has 120 employees working at the Airport, where it uses 16 Explosive Trace Detection (ETD) machines for screening luggage and four ETD stations for screening passengers' carry-on luggage.

The passenger checkpoint includes three primary steps: (1) all carry-on baggage must be placed on the belt of the X-ray machine; (2) all passengers must walk through a metal detector. If an alarm is set off, the passenger will undergo a secondary screening; and (3) secondary screening includes a hand-wand inspection in conjunction with a pat-down inspection.

How Does the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance Influence the Proposed Project and Alternatives?

In 1981, the City of Long Beach adopted a noise control ordinance affecting the Airport that limited the number of air carrier flights to 15 per day and required the use of quieter aircraft. The purpose of the ordinance was to reduce the "cumulative" noise generated by the Airport. The ordinance was challenged by the commercial airlines in federal court. Following an injunction by the court, the City formed a task force and prepared an Airport Noise Compatibility Program, pursuant to Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) regulations. The task force recommended that commercial air carriers be allowed to increase operations to 41 daily flights, provided certain noise limits could be met.

In 1986, the City adopted a second aircraft noise control ordinance that established noise limits and restricted the number of air carrier operations to 32 flights per day.¹ The federal court rejected this ordinance, finding that the limitation on the number of flights was too restrictive. The federal court ultimately ordered the City to permit a minimum of 41 commercial air carrier flights per day. The City appealed the federal court's order; however, in January 1992, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals upheld the trial court's decision.

In an effort to resolve protracted litigation, the City and the airlines entered into a stipulated settlement agreement. In February 1995, the City of Long Beach City Council certified a Negative Declaration (ND-19-94), which analyzed the proposed settlement of long-standing airport noise litigation between the City of Long Beach and a number of air carriers and other users of the Long Beach Municipal Airport titled *Alaska Airlines et al. v. City of Long Beach* ([1991] 951 F2d 977). Under the settlement, the City Council agreed to adopt a new Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance. For the period from adoption of the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance through 2001, no party to the settlement would be allowed to challenge the Ordinance, and the City would not be allowed to amend the Ordinance so as to make it more

¹ To provide CEQA compliance for the noise ordinance, the City of Long Beach certified the Final Environmental Impact Report (E-45-85/ERR-82-85) for the Airport Noise Compatibility Program FAR Part 150 Study at Long Beach Airport (SCH No. 86012911).

restrictive on aircraft operations. The court approved the settlement and entered a final judgment on June 13, 1995.

As a requirement of the settlement, the City enacted Chapter 16.43 of the Municipal Code. Chapter 16.43 permits air carriers to operate a minimum of 41 airline flights per day at the Airport. In addition, Chapter 16.43 permits commuter carriers to operate a minimum of 25 flights per day.

In a separate action, the City adopted an Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance that includes two major components. The first establishes Single Event Noise Exposure Level (SENEL) for aircraft operating into and out of the Airport. The second establishes a noise budget for the various categories of aircraft at the Airport. The Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance allows the permitted number of flights per day to be increased in each operator flight restriction category as long as the flights operate below the CNEL budgets.² In order for the number of flights to be increased and still comply with the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance the airlines would have to optimize their flight operations by using quieter aircraft and reducing the number of late night operations. Under optimal conditions, which have never been achieved at the Airport, the estimated number of increased flights would range between 7 and 11 flights.

In 1990, while the litigation between the City and the carriers was pending, Congress passed the *Airport Noise and Capacity Act* (ANCA), which limited an Airport operator's right to control Stage 3 aircraft.³ ANCA's specific objective was to stop local municipalities from imposing new restrictions on aircraft operations without complying with significant procedural requirements and obtaining federal approval. Included within the ANCA legislation is a "grandfather" provision, which permits Long Beach Airport to continue to enforce the flight and noise restrictions that are contained in the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance (Chapter 16.43). In May 2003, the FAA reaffirmed the "grandfather" status of the Ordinance under ANCA.

Optimized Flights Scenario

The Proposed Project does not recommend any modifications to the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance; nor does it recommend any other actions that would directly or indirectly affect the number of aircraft operations at the Airport. However, at the direction of the City Council, the draft environmental impact report (DEIR) that was prepared for the Proposed Project also addresses the potential impacts associated with an Optimized Flights Scenario in the interest of fully disclosing potential impacts associated with what may be a future possible flight scenario at the Airport.

The Optimized Flights Scenario addresses the increased flight levels that are provided for in the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance (i.e., a minimum of 41 commercial and 25 commuter flights). It also addresses the impacts associated with additional commercial carrier flights that could occur at the Airport should the airlines optimize their flight operations. (It should be noted that in order for the number of commercial flights to be increased and still comply with the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance, the airlines would have to optimize their flight operations through methods such as using quieter aircraft and reducing the number of late night operations.) Under optimal conditions, which have never been achieved at the Airport, up to 11 commercial flights could be added.

² The Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance is provided as an attachment in Appendix F and can also be viewed at the Airport web site at www.lgb.org.

³ A "Stage 3 aircraft" means an airplane that has been shown to comply with Stage 3 noise levels prescribed in FAR Part 36, Appendix C.

As previously stated, 41 daily commercial flights are already occurring at the Airport. The Optimized Flights Scenario is composed of these plus 25 daily commuter flights and up to 11 additional daily commercial flights, for a total of 52 commercial and 25 commuter flights. The City would not have any discretion to limit daily operations at the Airport to less than this if the conditions outlined in the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance are met. Therefore, the Optimized Flights Scenario is applied to all of the project alternatives as well as the Proposed Project because it could occur under the existing regulatory framework.

It should be noted that at the time that the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Proposed Project was issued and the baseline for the DEIR was established, there were no commuter operations at the Airport. Subsequently, America West has initiated daily commuter flights and Delta and Smooth Flight Holdings have been granted conditional commuter flights. All 25 commuter flights provided for in the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance are expected to be in regular service between December 2005 and Spring 2006.

Annual Noise Budget Assessment

The air carrier and commuter noise budget assessment is conducted annually based on the October 1 through September 30 timeframe, with City Council action required on or before November 15 of each year. Effective dates for any incremental flight increases would be January 1 of the following year. The Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance provides that no additional flights may be authorized if forecasts show that such flights would result in the air carriers or commuters exceeding their 1989-1990-baseline noise budget for the following noise budget year.

The Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance also provides that any flights allocated over the minimum 41 commercial flights and the 25 commuter flights shall be reduced as necessary based on the following year's assessment to ensure that air carrier and commuter airline noise budgets are not exceeded.

What Would the Proposed Project Include?

The City Council, after reviewing the material from the Airport Advisory Commission (AAC) and receiving public input, defined the scope of the project and alternatives to be evaluated in the DEIR. The Proposed Project provides improvements to the existing Airport Terminal Building and related facilities at the Airport. As previously stated, its objective of the Proposed Project is to accommodate recent increases in flight activity at the Airport consistent with operational limitations of the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance and the 1995 Settlement Agreement, as well as to better meet security requirements imposed by TSA. The Proposed Project includes construction of, or alteration to, the 13 areas listed and described below:

- Holdrooms
- Concession Area
- Passenger Security Screening
- Baggage Security Screening
- Baggage Claim Devices
- Baggage Service Office
- Restrooms
- Office Space
- Ticketing Facilities
- Airline Gates
- Aircraft Parking Positions
- Vehicular Parking
- Traffic and Pedestrian Circulation

If the minimum number of flights allowed under the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance (i.e., a daily minimum of 41 commercial and 25 commuter flights) occurs, an estimated 4.2 MAP would be served at the Airport. Considering all improvements associated with the Proposed Project,

the size of permanent Airport terminal space would increase from 56,320 square feet to 102,850 square feet. The generalized location of various Terminal Area Improvements is depicted in Exhibit 1.

How the overall terminal area square footage would be allocated among the various uses is described below in more detail. While it is premature to develop a final design for the Airport improvements prior to City Council selection of a preferred alternative and certification of the CEQA document, a schematic layout showing a potential footprint of the Airport improvements was developed consistent with the Guiding Principles, as described below, to provide the environmental team basic parameters for evaluation in the DEIR (refer to Exhibit 2, *Concept Floor Plan*). The precise size and configuration of the proposed improvements will be determined during final design to ensure compliance with the applicable fire and building codes, safety and security requirements, and operational necessities.

The overall size of the Airport terminal area improvements would not exceed the square footage allocations and would be consistent with the parameters outlined below. Though modifications to the design may occur, if the improvements are generally contained within the footprint shown, the precise location of the facilities would not substantially alter the impact analysis.

What Are the Guiding Principles?

Consistent with the Guiding Principles, the proposed improvements would be designed to ensure construction of the new improvements are compatible with the existing historic Airport Terminal Building and would not compromise the historic integrity of the building. The Guiding Principles are drawn from three primary sources. The first source is a memorandum of understanding (MOU) dated May 7, 1990, adopted by the City Council and Cultural Heritage Commission, which provides guidelines for future environmental review of the Airport Terminal Building. The MOU includes the Secretary of the Interior's standards for rehabilitation of historic buildings, was adopted by resolution of the Cultural Heritage Commission. The second source is the Development and Use Standards for the Long Beach Airport Terminal Planned Development Plan Ordinance adopted by the City Council on September 2, 1997. The final document is a memorandum on considerations for new construction prepared by PCR.

Additionally, the City is committed to ensuring that the new facilities would meet high standards for energy efficiency and environmental design. The intention is to construct the facilities consistent with LEED standards. LEED, which stands for Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design.

How Would the Proposed Improvements Look?

The discussion below describes the square footage allocation to the various uses within the Airport Terminal Building and surrounding area. In addition to new construction and the removal of the temporary modular buildings that have been brought onto the Airport to provide additional holdroom space, modifications to the interior of the Airport Terminal Building would be required to maximize efficiency of the floor space. This would include relocating the ticketing and concession areas and opening the center of the Airport Terminal Building to the proposed new holdroom area. As shown in the concept floor plan (Exhibit 2) this would result in a configuration similar to the original Airport Terminal Building layout.⁴ The Proposed Project also intends to evaluate the feasibility of removing the existing carpeting to reveal the historic mosaics on the

⁴ Prior to constructing the permanent holdroom adjacent to the terminal, public access to the aircraft use to be through the back of the terminal rather than out the north and south doors to the temporary holdrooms.

main concourse of the first floor.⁵ The mosaics, which have been covered with carpet and possibly linoleum, are similar to the mosaics that are visible on the intermediate stair landings and the corridor on the second floor.

The new construction would generally be set back from the existing Airport Terminal Building so as not to appear as an “add on” to the existing terminal structure. The new construction would only connect to the Airport Terminal Building at the covered circulation corridor that provides access to the holdroom and at locations where baggage would move by conveyor from ticketing areas to baggage screening. These connections are necessary to meet TSA’s security requirements.

In addition to the building area, covered open areas would also be provided. The preliminary concept plan shows covered areas for the baggage make-up area (where the airlines receive screened bags from TSA, which are then sorted and loaded onto baggage carts), the baggage claim area, the ticketing and queuing areas, and a “meeters and greeters” area. These areas would have a roof structure but not side enclosures. Precise uses would be determined during project design. Other features that would be incorporated to visually enhance the improvements include: (1) ensuring that the roofline on the holdroom is below the observation deck on the second floor so views on to the airfield are not blocked, and (2) enclosing all air conditioning and heating units so the mechanical equipment is not visible. Exhibit 3 provides a view perspective of the conceptual design. The space allocation among the various uses is outlined below.

Holdrooms

Currently, the Airport holdrooms are comprised of both the 1984 permanent holdroom and temporary modular structures. As part of the Proposed Project, the 13,150 square feet of temporary holdroom currently being provided through the use of modular buildings would be replaced with 21,171 square feet of new permanent floor space. This, combined with the existing approximately 6,500 square feet of permanent holdroom, would result in a total of 27,671 square feet of holdroom to accommodate the existing and projected passenger levels. This is a net increase of 8,021 square feet.

Concession Area

Currently, there are 5,460 square feet of concessions at the Airport. The Proposed Project would add an additional 9,541 square feet for this purpose. This would result in a total of 15,001 square feet for concessions.

Passenger Security Screening

The security screening of passengers would be designed to meet the requirements of the TSA. Currently, there is 3,900 square feet of passenger security screening area. With the Proposed Project, there would be an additional 7,000 square feet devoted to passenger security screening or a total of 10,900 square feet.

Baggage Security Screening

Currently, the Airport does not provide any structure for conducting baggage screening. TSA has indicated that this open-air situation is not sufficient because of the sensitivity of the

⁵ The feasibility of restoring the mosaics is being explored as part of the Project. Until such time as the terminal improvements are initiated it is not possible to know if restoration is feasible. Considerations would be the conditions of the mosaics, the cost at restoring them, and ability to meet safety requirements (i.e., potential for slipping).

equipment being used. The Proposed Project would provide a 7,000-square foot structure for security screening of baggage.

Baggage Claim Devices

The Airport has 226 linear feet of passenger side baggage claim devices. The proposed baggage claim area would provide a total of 510 linear feet for passenger side baggage claim. The baggage claim would be similar to the existing conditions, in that they would be open air, but covered with a roof or canopy.

Baggage Service Office and Multi-Purpose Room

The Airport does not have a baggage service office or sufficient meeting room space. The Proposed Project would allocate a total of 1,200 square feet for these uses. This area would provide an area for on-site Airport meetings, a holding place for unclaimed bags, bags that were misdirected, or for reporting lost baggage.

Restrooms

Currently, the Airport has 1,330 square feet of restroom area in non-secure portions of the Airport terminal area. As part of the project, there would be an increase of 2,000 square feet in restrooms in non-secure area, for a total of 3,330 square feet of restroom areas.

Office Space for Security, Airport, and Airline Support Staff

Office space would be provided to serve the needs of the TSA, the airlines and Airport administration. TSA currently occupies 3,600 square feet in a temporary modular building. This would be replaced with permanent facilities and augmented with an additional 1,590 square feet, for a total of 5,191 square feet.

Airline operation offices are currently housed in approximately 2,000 square feet within the Airport terminal area. An additional 3,754 square feet would be allocated for this use, resulting in a total of 5,754 square feet.

Airport offices and conference areas would be increased from 6,970 square feet to 11,970 square feet.

Overall, combined office space (i.e., all three categories) at the Airport terminal area would increase 10,375 square feet from the current 12,570 square feet to 22,915 square feet.

Ticketing Facilities

Expansion of the existing ticketing facilities is also proposed to accommodate the existing demand at the Airport. The ticketing facilities can be broken into four categories: (1) ticket counter area, (2) ticket counter queuing area, (3) airline ticket office, and (4) circulation area for the ticketing area.

Ticket counter area is proposed to increase by 680 square feet from 1,250 to 1,930 square feet. Ticket counter queuing area is proposed to increase from 1,400 to 2,800 square feet. The airline ticket office area is proposed to increase from 4,360 square feet to 4,603 square feet.

Circulation area for the ticketing counter area is proposed to increase by 4,100 square feet from 1,400 to 5,500 square feet. Overall, the combined space for ticketing operations (i.e., all four

categories) at the Airport terminal area would increase 6,423 square feet from the current 8,410 square feet to 14,833 square feet.

Airline Gates

The Airport currently has eight aircraft gates for the boarding, loading and unloading of aircraft. With the Proposed Project this would be increased to 11 gates. At Long Beach Airport, the term “gates” is used to identify the doors in the holdrooms that are used for passenger boarding. Jetways, which provide direct access from the Airport terminal area to the aircraft, are not possible given that jetways require a second story to allow access and the Proposed Project includes only one story holdroom.

Aircraft Parking Positions

The Airport currently has 10 aircraft parking positions. The DEIR addresses increasing the number of aircraft parking positions from 10 to as many as 14 aircraft parking positions.

This increase would result in the take-back of property currently leased to Million Air and used for general aviation “tie-down” parking and valet parking. This area is located north of the existing Airport Terminal Building. The general aviation aircraft displaced from the Million Air site would be relocated to a new tie-down area south of Runway 12-30, known as Parcel O. Parcel O is located on Airport property near the intersection of Clark Ave. and Willow St.

Vehicular Parking

Vehicular parking at the Airport is available both on site (surface lots and parking structure) and off site in parking lots leased by the Airport from Boeing (Lot D). There are currently 2,835 permanent parking spaces at the Airport and approximately 2,100 leased spaces. The leased spaces are leased on a month-to-month basis. The project proposes construction of a new parking structure which, combined with the existing parking structure and surface parking, would provide a total of 6,286 spaces. This would eliminate the need for the off-site leased parking spaces. The project would provide 1,351 spaces above the existing number of spaces currently available for Airport use.

Proposed improvements include a new parking structure, on-site roadway modifications, and architectural modifications to the existing parking structure. The new parking structure would be designed for an estimated 4,000 spaces and would be constructed east of the existing parking structure in the area currently used for surface parking. The structure's location would require the relocation of the east side of the Donald Douglas Drive loop.

Proposed modifications to the existing parking structure would include a new façade to match the new parking structure and complement the architecture of the Terminal Building. The façades of the Terminal Building and parking structures would provide a unified appearance and enhance the aesthetics of the terminal area and the Airport Terminal Building's identification as a Cultural Heritage Landmark. Other improvements include replacement of the existing elevator, modifications to the entrances and exits, offices for the parking management company, and offices and public counters for the car rental agencies, along with vehicle preparation and return vehicle parking areas.

Proposed modifications to remaining surface lots would include modified access points, re-fencing, re-striping, signage, etc.

Traffic and Pedestrian Circulation Improvements

Proposed improvements would include the extension of the south side of the Donald Douglas Drive loop to exit onto Lakewood Boulevard and the addition and/or modifications of signage, lighting, and pavement markings to aid in the safe movement of vehicular and pedestrian traffic through the parking structures, lots and terminal area.

Have Any Alternatives to the Proposed Project Been Considered?

Consistent with City Council direction, three alternatives to the proposed project were analyzed in the DEIR. A fourth alternative that would have reduced the terminal space from its current square footage (the “roll-back” alternative), was considered but rejected because it would not effectively meet the project objectives.

Alternative A: 2003 NOP

This alternative was based on the improvements proposed in the 2003 NOP, with minor modifications. Alternative A assumes the Airport terminal area would be a maximum of 97,545 square feet. The nature of the improvements would generally be the same as the Proposed Project. Compared to the Proposed Project, there are minor reductions in square footage in all except the following categories:

- Baggage security screening would be the same as the Proposed Project.
- No additional space is assumed for ticketing facilities.
- The amount of Airport office space is increased compared to the Proposed Project.

The 2003 NOP assumed 16 aircraft parking spaces. However, the City Council determined in February 2005 that no more than 14 aircraft parking spaces would be evaluated in the DEIR; therefore, the 16 aircraft parking spaces presented in the 2003 NOP have been reduced to 14 spaces for evaluation in this DEIR. Other aspects of the project, such as the number of gates and vehicular parking would be the same for Alternative A as for the Proposed Project.

The features described for the Proposed Project, such as modification to the interior of the existing Airport Terminal Building, the relocation of general aviation aircraft to Parcel O, the LEED standards, and application of the Guiding Principles during project design would all apply to Alternative A.

Alternative B: Reduced Facilities

This alternative further reduces the size of the Airport terminal area improvements compared to the Proposed Project. This alternative assumes the Airport terminal area facilities would be a maximum of 79,725 square feet. Similar to Alternative A, the nature of the improvements would generally be the same, though reduced in size compared to the Proposed Project, with the following exceptions:

- Baggage security screening would be the same as the Proposed Project.
- No additional space is assumed for ticketing facilities.
- No additional Airport office space is assumed as part of this alternative.

Other aspects of the project, such as the number of gates, aircraft parking and vehicular parking would be the same for Alternative B as for the Proposed Project. The features described for the Proposed Project, such as modification to the interior of the existing Airport Terminal Building,

the relocation of general aviation aircraft to Parcel O, the LEED standards, and application of the Guiding Principles during project design would all apply to Alternative B.

Alternative C: No Project

Alternative C represents the No Project Alternative, which assumes that no new facilities would be provided at the Airport. The temporary holdrooms provided at the Airport would remain in place. The Airport terminal facilities, including holdrooms, would be a total of 56,320 square feet. The airline gates would be limited to the eight that currently exist. A total of 10 aircraft parking spaces would be provided at the Airport. The vehicle parking would be limited to the parking available on site. This would include the existing parking structure and surface parking. The spaces that are currently leased off site would not be available because of the short-term nature of the leases. Based on recent discussions Boeing has indicated the leases would not be available on a long-term basis. Since no new vehicular parking spaces would be provided, this alternative would have a net loss of approximately 2,100 parking spaces compared to current conditions.

Additionally, it should be noted that with the current configuration at the Airport, there is not sufficient square footage to meet TSA requirements for passenger screening. Should Alternative C be selected there may be a need to provide subsequent improvements to ensure sufficient square footage is allocated for passenger screening. This may be accomplished through modifications to the existing Airport Terminal Building or by providing additional temporary space.

What is the Proposed Construction Schedule?

The Proposed Project is designed to accommodate the current minimum permitted number of flights and projected passenger levels at the Airport. The phasing of the Proposed Project would be determined based on availability of funding and service priorities. Design of the improvements would begin following the certification of the EIR. Pending funding, it is presently anticipated that construction of some of the improvements could begin shortly after the completion of the EIR. The construction would be phased to minimize impacts to operations at the Airport. Implementation of improvements to serve commuter aircraft (i.e., aircraft parking spaces) would be phased depending on the level of commuter services at the Airport. Table 1 provides an assumed construction-phasing schedule for the improvements. Phasing is expected to be the same for all the build alternatives.

**TABLE 1
LONG BEACH AIRPORT TERMINAL AREA IMPROVEMENT PROJECT
CONSTRUCTION PHASING ESTIMATE**

Element	Construction Start Date	Duration/Completion
Parcel O	Immediately following EIR certification (March/April 2006)	3 to 4 months
Parking Structure	3-4 months after EIR certified (June/July 2006)	18 months/Dec. 2007
Terminal Improvements	1 year after EIR certified (March 2007)	24 months/March 2009
Source: City of Long Beach Public Works, 2005.		

Would the Proposed Project Result in Any Impacts?

During construction, the Proposed Project would result in significant impacts to aesthetics, air quality, cultural resources, and hazards and hazardous wastes. In most cases, the proposed mitigation program would reduce these impacts to a level considered less than significant. However, even with implementation of the mitigation program, construction-related air quality impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

The impacts and mitigation measures associated with the Proposed Project are summarized in Table 2. The significance of each impact is indicated by the following abbreviations that parenthetically follow the summary description of the effect: B=beneficial, S=significant impact, LS=impact that is less than significant according to the State CEQA Guidelines, and NI=no impact.

The mitigation program is comprised of project design features (PDF), standard conditions and regulations, and mitigation measures, which all serve to reduce potential environmental impacts. A number is provided at the end of each measure in the table, which provides the number reference of the full text in the EIR mitigation program. Additionally, the Proposed Project provides an opportunity to improve future conditions at the Airport. Table 2 presents components of the mitigation program that are not required to mitigate impacts of the Proposed Project, but have been recommended because they will provide long term general benefit to the community. Italicized type distinguishes these measures from the mitigation measures required to address impacts of the Proposed Project.

What Impacts Are Associated with the Optimized Flights Scenario?

Under the Optimized Flights Scenario, operations at the Airport would result in impacts to air quality, land use, and transportation and circulation. The proposed mitigation program would reduce land use and transportation impacts to levels considered less than significant. Air quality impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. The impacts and mitigation measures associated with the Optimized Flights are summarized in Table 3.

**TABLE 2
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Level Of Significance After Mitigation/Status Of The Mitigation Measure
Aesthetics		
<p>The Planned Development zoning regulations and design guidelines establish standards for improvements at the Airport that address potential visual impacts. The design of the Proposed Project would comply with applicable design standards for development at the Airport. (NI)</p>	<p>Prior to building plan approval, the Planning Commission shall ensure that all development complies with the development standards and design guidelines contained in Ordinance No. C-7496, Development and Use Standards for the Long Beach Airport Terminal Planned Development Plan (PD-12). (SC 3.1-1)</p> <p>Prior to building plan approval, the Cultural Heritage Commission shall ensure that any new construction proposed adjacent to the Terminal building or attached onto it shall comply with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic buildings, and more specifically, the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation (Standards). (SC 3.1-2)</p> <p>Prior to building plan approval, the Cultural Heritage Commission shall ensure that all development shall comply with the May 7, 1990 MOU adopted by the City Council and Cultural Heritage Commission providing guidelines for future environmental review of the Airport Terminal building (the MOU is contained in Appendix B). (SC 3.1-3)</p>	No Impact.
<p>The Proposed Project would alter views of the project site during construction activities, potentially resulting in short-term aesthetic impacts. (SI)</p>	<p>During construction activities, the construction contractor shall ensure that construction materials and equipment staging areas be located away from existing residential uses and, when feasible, appropriate screening (i.e., temporary fencing with opaque material) shall be used to buffer views of the construction site. (MM 3.1-1)</p> <p>During construction activities, the construction contractor shall ensure that temporary construction-related security lighting shall be arranged so that direct rays will not shine on or produce glare for adjacent street traffic and residential uses. The light fixtures specified for the Project design must comply with the standard of the Illuminating Engineering Society for full cutoff capability. (MM 3.1-2)</p>	Less than significant.
<p>The Proposed Project would result in construction activities and expansion of the terminal facilities. This could result in light and glare impacts associated with security lighting and light emanating from the proposed improvements. (SI)</p>	<p>Prior to building plan approval, the Planning Commission shall ensure that all exterior lighting be designed and located as to avoid intrusive effects on the runway operations, so as not to result in an air safety hazard. Low-intensity street lighting and low-intensity exterior lighting shall be used throughout the development to the extent feasible. Lighting fixtures shall use shielding, if necessary to prevent spill lighting on adjacent off-site uses. (MM 3.1-3)</p>	Less than significant.

TABLE 2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Level Of Significance After Mitigation/Status Of The Mitigation Measure
	Prior to building plan approval, the Planning Commission shall ensure that all development projects use reflective glass that is less than 20 percent and all other materials used on exterior buildings and structures shall be selected with attention to minimizing reflective glare. (MM 3.1-4)	
Air Quality and Health Risk Assessment		
Project related construction activities would result in significant short-term construction related air quality impact for NO _x and VOC. (SI)	<p>During construction of the Proposed Project, the City and its contractors will be required to comply with regional rules that would assist in reducing short-term air pollutant emissions. SCAQMD Rule 402 requires that air pollutant emissions should not create a nuisance off-site. SCAQMD Rule 403 requires that fugitive dust be controlled with the best available control measures so the presence of such dust does not remain visible in the atmosphere beyond the property line of the emission source. (SC 3.2-1)</p> <p>The contract specifications shall require and the City shall enforce that all building materials, architectural coatings, and cleaning solvents comply with all applicable SCAQMD rules and regulations. (SC 3.2-2)</p> <p>The contract specifications shall require and the City shall enforce general contractors to ensure that all construction equipment is properly tuned and maintained in accordance with manufacturers' specifications. (MM 3.2-1)</p> <p>The contract specifications shall require and the City shall enforce general contractors to maintain and operate construction equipment so as to minimize exhaust emissions. During construction, engines on trucks and vehicles in loading and unloading queues will be turned off when not in use, to reduce vehicle emissions. Construction activities should be phased and scheduled to avoid emissions peaks and discontinued during second-stage smog alerts. (MM 3.2-2)</p> <p>The contract specifications shall require and the City shall enforce general contractors sweep streets as needed during construction, but not more frequently than hourly, if visible soil material has been carried onto adjacent public roads. (MM 3.2-3)</p> <p>The contract specifications shall require and the City shall enforce general contractors to visually inspect construction equipment prior to leaving the site; loose dirt shall be washed off with wheel washers as necessary. (MM 3.2-4)</p>	Significant.

TABLE 2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Level Of Significance After Mitigation/Status Of The Mitigation Measure
	<p>During construction, the City shall coordinate with the contractor to maximize the ability to power construction activity utilizing electricity from power poles rather than temporary diesel or gasoline power generators, to the extent possible. (MM 3.2-5)</p> <p>The contract specifications shall require that all on-site mobile equipment used during construction shall be powered by alternative fuel sources (i.e., methanol, natural gas, propane, or butane) where feasible. (MM 3.2-6)</p> <p>During construction the City of Long Beach shall provide a location and require the contractor to store all construction equipment used in the project construction within the project site (away from adjacent residential areas) to reduce the impact on the roadway system and the resultant air emissions. On-site construction equipment staging areas and construction worker parking lots shall be located on either paved surfaces or unpaved surfaces that are periodically treated with non-toxic soil stabilizers. (MM 3.2-7)</p> <p>The contract specifications shall require and the City shall enforce the contractor to schedule all deliveries related to construction activities that affect traffic flow during off-peak hours (e.g., 10:00 am and 3:00 pm) and deliveries shall be coordinated to achieve consolidated truck trips. When traffic flow is impacted by the movement of construction materials and/or equipment, temporary traffic controls shall be provided to improve traffic flow (e.g., flag person). (MM 3.2-8)</p> <p>The contract specifications shall require all on-site heavy-duty construction equipment shall be equipped with diesel particulate traps where feasible to the extent that this equipment is available at the time the contracts are awarded. (MM 3.2-9)</p> <p>The contract specifications shall require and the City shall enforce that emulsified diesel fuel will be used in diesel-fueled construction equipment that is not equipped with diesel particulate traps to reduce NO_x emissions. (MM 3.2-10)</p>	
<p>Though no impact has been identified associated with long term use of the terminal facility, through application of standard conditions pertaining to project design and operation of the Airport air emissions would be minimized. (LS)</p>	<p>As part of project design, the City of Long Beach shall ensure the terminal area improvements are designed and constructed to meet LEED specifications. (PDF 3.2-1)</p> <p>The contract specifications shall require and the City shall enforce that the design of the terminal improvements meet LEED standards. All new and substantially modified buildings shall meet California Title 24 Energy</p>	<p>Beneficial.</p>

TABLE 2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Level Of Significance After Mitigation/Status Of The Mitigation Measure
	<p>Efficiency standards for water heating, space heating and cooling, to the extent feasible. (SC 3.2-3)</p> <p>The contract specifications shall require and the City shall enforce that all new and modified point source facilities (e.g., utility equipment, fuel storage and dispensing) obtain all required permits from the SCAQMD. To obtain these permits, the facilities will need to include Best Available Control Technology (BACT) that reduces emissions of criteria pollutants. (SC 3.2-4)</p> <p>The contract specifications shall require and the City shall enforce that all exterior lighting use color-corrected low sodium lighting. (SC 3.2-5)</p> <p><i>The following measures are recommended where the Proposed Project would have an opportunity to further reduce emissions resulting in a net benefit from the Proposed Project.</i></p> <p><i>During project design, the architect shall provide that all fixtures used for lighting exterior common areas are regulated by automatic devices to turn off lights when they are not needed. (MM 3.2-11)</i></p> <p><i>As part of the air carrier ramp design, the City of Long Beach shall incorporate electric charging stations infrastructure to support operation of electric GSE and other on-airport vehicles. (MM 3.2-12)</i></p> <p><i>As part of the air carrier ramp design, preconditioned air and 400 Hz power from electric units (or electric power grid) will incorporate provisions at the commercial passenger aircraft parking positions to allow aircraft pilots the ability to plug in at the gate and turn off the APU. (MM 3.2-13)</i></p> <p><i>Ultra-low sulfur diesel fuel will be provided for diesel-fueled GSE that are not readily convertible to electrical power. (MM 3.2-14)</i></p> <p><i>Through its lease language with them, the City of Long Beach shall require the airlines to comply with the South Coast GSE Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) signed by the airlines and CARB in December 2002 or replacement agreements and/or regulations. Through the implementation of MM 3.2-12 and MM 3.2-13, the Airport will design the infrastructure necessary to assist airlines in complying with the GSE MOU. The GSE MOU includes provisions for retrofitting diesel GSE with particulate traps where feasible. Therefore, compliance with the GSE MOU will reduce PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} impacts as well as NO_x and VOC emissions. (MM 3.2-15)</i></p>	

TABLE 2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Level Of Significance After Mitigation/Status Of The Mitigation Measure
Cultural Resources		
<p>The Proposed Project would result in alterations to a designated historical landmark. (SI)</p>	<p>Project design incorporates the following guidance documents to protect the historic integrity of the existing terminal: (1) May 7, 1990, memorandum of understanding (MOU) by the Neighborhood and Historic Preservation Officer for the City of Long Beach providing guidelines for future environmental review of the Airport terminal building; (2) Secretary of the Interior's standards for rehabilitation of historic buildings; (3) Development and Use Standards for the Long Beach Airport Terminal Planned Development Plan Ordinance adopted by the City Council on September 2, 1997; (4) the City's Cultural Heritage Ordinance (Chapter 2.63 of the Municipal Code); and (5) a memorandum on considerations for new construction prepared by PCR (June 22, 2005). (PDF 3.3-1)</p> <p>In compliance with Chapter 2.63 of the Municipal Code no permits for the alteration, remodel, enlarging, or improvements to the Airport Terminal, shall be issued prior to review by the Cultural Heritage Commission and issuance by the Commission of a certificate of appropriateness. (SC 3.3-3)</p> <p>As part of Airport Terminal design, the project architect shall place any connection between the new structure and the 1941 Airport Terminal beneath the existing cornice, to be consistent with the Streamline Moderne design. (MM 3.3-1)</p> <p>As part of Airport Terminal design, the project architect shall ensure that window treatments reference the style of the original Airport Terminal windows. (MM 3.3-2)</p> <p>The windows on the south elevation, first story, were removed and the spaces filled in during the 1984 improvements. One section now exhibits a tile mosaic, which shall be left in place. As part of Airport Terminal design, the window closest to the southwest corner wall shall be returned or replicated to its original appearance, if feasible (Secretary's Standard #6). (MM 3.3-3)</p> <p>During project design, the project architect shall reference the style of the doorframes on the east and south facades for the new doorway proposed for the north side of the building. (MM 3.3-4)</p> <p>The exterior material should be compatible in type, color and finish to the existing material used on the original Airport Terminal building. (MM 3.3-5)</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>

TABLE 2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Level Of Significance After Mitigation/Status Of The Mitigation Measure
	During project design, the proposed shelter/ticketing area on either side of the existing Airport Terminal shall be scaled down. This can be done with either a lower profile, possibly with a flat roof that fits in visually with the horizontal nature of the architectural style of the Airport Terminal. (MM 3.3-6)	
Because of the low probability of discovery of archaeological and paleontological resources, impacts were determined to be less than significant. Implementation of standard conditions would ensure less than impacts if resources were discovered during construction. (LS)	<p>Should any archaeological resources be uncovered during grading or excavation activities, these activities shall be diverted to a part of the site away from the find, and a qualified archaeologist shall be contracted by the contractor to: (1) ascertain the significance of the resource; (2) establish protocol with the project applicant to protect such resources; (3) ascertain the presence of additional resources; and (4) provide additional monitoring of the site, if deemed appropriate. If human remains are discovered on the site, the Los Angeles County Coroner shall be contacted to examine the remains, and the provisions of Section 15064.5(3) of the CEQA Guidelines shall be followed. (SC 3.3-1)</p> <p>If human remains are encountered during ground-disturbing activities, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition of the materials pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. The County Coroner must be notified of the find immediately. If the remains are determined to be prehistoric, the Coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC will determine and notify a Most Likely Descendent (MLD). With the permission of the landowner or his/her authorized representative, the MLD may inspect the site of the discovery. The descendent must complete the inspection within 24 hours of notification by the NAHC. The MLD may recommend scientific removal and nondestructive analysis of human remains and items associated with Native American burials. (SC 3.3-2)</p> <p>Should any paleontological resources be uncovered during grading or excavation activities, the construction contractor shall divert activities to a part of the site away from the find, and a qualified paleontologist shall be contracted by the contractor to: (1) ascertain the significance of the resource; (2) establish protocol with the project applicant to protect such resources; (3) ascertain the presence of additional resources; and (4) provide additional monitoring of the site, if deemed appropriate. If human remains are discovered on the site, the Los Angeles County Coroner shall be contacted to examine the remains, and the provisions of Section 15064.5(3) of the CEQA Guidelines shall be followed. (SC 3.3-4)</p>	Less than significant.

TABLE 2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Level Of Significance After Mitigation/Status Of The Mitigation Measure
Hazards and Hazardous Materials		
During construction, asbestos containing materials could be disturbed and introduced into the environment. (SI)	<p>Compliance with SCAQMD Rule 1403 (SC 3.4-3 and SC 3.4-4)</p> <p>Prior to the initiation of demolition/construction, the Contractor shall develop an approved Health and Safety Contingency Plan (HSCP) in the event that unanticipated/unknown environmental contaminants are encountered during construction. The plan shall be developed to protect workers, safeguard the environment, and meet the requirements of the CCR, Title 8, General Industry Safety Orders – Control of Hazardous Substances. The Plan shall include measures for handling any unknown wastes or suspect materials discovered during construction by the Contractor, which he/she believes may involve hazardous waste or hazardous materials.</p> <p>The HSCP should be prepared as a supplemental to the Contractor's Site-Specific Health and Safety Plan, which should be prepared to meet the requirements of CCR Title 8, Construction Safety Orders. (MM 3.4-1)</p>	Less than significant.
During construction, lead-based paint could be introduced into the environment. (SI)	Prior to the demolition of any on-site building or portion of any on-site building constructed prior to 1973, the City shall screen the buildings for lead-based pain and mitigate in accordance with all applicable federal, state, and local regulatory requirements. (MM 3.4-2) MM 3.4-1, provided above would also apply to this potential impact.	Less than significant.
During grading activities at Parcel O, DDT could be introduced into the environment. (SI)	Prior to issuance of grading permits, the applicant shall test the soil for aerially deposited lead and dichloro-diphenyl-trichloroethane (DDT). As a result of soil testing, should aerially deposited lead or DDT be found in quantities that exceed acceptable thresholds, the applicant shall develop a remediation program to dispose of soil material properly. (SC 3.4-9) MM 3.4-1, provided above would also apply to this potential impact.	Less than significant.
During construction, hazardous materials could be transported onto the Airport adjacent to school sites along Willow Street. (SI)	As part of the contract specification, a haul route, which could include Willow Street, shall be designated by the City Engineer, or his designee. During construction, the City Engineer, or his designee shall instruct every contractor that no hazardous or acutely hazardous materials may be transported onto the Airport via Willow Street to avoid potential impacts within one-quarter mile of the Alpert Jewish Community Center, where school programs are conducted. (MM 3.4-4)	Less than significant.
Project design and existing regulations would ensure the operation of the Proposed Project improvements would minimize potential impacts associated with the handling of hazardous materials. (NI)	The proposed terminal improvements would be constructed in a manner consistent with LEED standards, which among other things, would minimize potential hazards and hazardous waste impacts. (PDF 3.4-1)	Less than significant.

TABLE 2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Level Of Significance After Mitigation/Status Of The Mitigation Measure
	<p>The Proposed Project and any additional flights associated with optimize flight operations would be required to comply with the provisions of the Long Beach Airport Certification Manual and Long Beach Airport Rules and Regulations pertaining to the handling, use, and disposal of hazardous materials and hazardous wastes. (SC 3.4-1)</p> <p>The Contractor shall develop a SWPPP to minimize potential short-term significant hazardous materials impacts associated with construction activities. (SC 3.4-2)</p> <p>The City Engineer, or his designee, shall verify that every contractor transporting or handling hazardous materials and/or wastes during project implementation has permits and licenses from all relative health and regulatory agencies to operate and properly manifest all hazardous or California regulated material. (SC 3.4-5)</p> <p>The Airport shall comply with the Airport Industrial NPDES permit (CAS000001/WDID 4B19S004985). Construction activities that disturbs more than one acre shall abide by the State issued State Water Resources Control Board Order 99-08 General Permit CAS000002. As part of this process, the Airport would be required to prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). (SC 3.4-6)</p> <p>Construction of the Proposed Project shall be in compliance with local and State construction and building requirements and regulations, including the Uniform Building Code. (SC 3.4-7)</p> <p>During demolition and excavation activities and during preparation of the geotechnical study in the design phase, the City shall have a qualified inspector onsite to inspect and sample the soil for contaminants. If observations during demolition activities indicate that site soil is affected by contaminants, demolition work should be stopped in the area involved until an analysis of the soil conditions can be performed and additional recommendations evaluated and performed as necessary. (MM 3.4-3)</p>	
Land Use		
No impacts were identified with the Proposed Project.	No mitigation is required.	No impacts.

TABLE 2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Level Of Significance After Mitigation/Status Of The Mitigation Measure
Noise		
Exhibits 4 through 7 provide a) baseline noise contours, b) projected noise contours with optimized flights, c) the location of those residences that are currently or projected to be within the 65 CNEL contours, and d) schools in the projected 60 CNEL contour.		
Night construction activity on Parcel O may result in noise levels in excess of the noise levels specified in the Long Beach Noise Ordinance if heavy construction equipment associated with grading and paving are used.	<p>The contractor shall comply with the City of Long Beach Noise Ordinance pertaining to limitations on construction activities to the extent feasible while minimizing any potential conflicts with aviation activities. (SC 3.6-2)</p> <p>The City shall conduct noise measurements during any night construction on Parcel O where such construction involves the use of heavy construction equipment such as front loaders, tractors, graders, paving machines, jackhammers or similar devices. Such measurements shall be made near the homes located directly across Clark Avenue from Parcel O. If any night measurement exceeds the limits specified in Sections 8.80.150 and 8.80.160 of the Long Beach Municipal Code as a result of the construction activity, the operation shall be terminated until such time that a construction noise mitigation plan can be put into effect that will result in compliance with the night time noise limits. Note that in the case where ambient noise levels exceed the noise limits specified in Section 8.80.160, the allowable noise exposure standard shall be increased per Section 8.80.150 [C] of the Municipal Code to reflect ambient levels. (MM 3.6-1)</p>	Less than significant.
The Proposed Project would not result in any project related noise impacts. (NI)	The Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance would apply to continued operations at the Airport. All future operations would need to be consistent with the provisions of the ordinance. (SC 3.6-1)	No impact.
Public Services		
The Proposed Project would not result in any significant impacts to police and fire services. The improvements would have beneficial effects on security (TSA and Airport security) by providing enhanced facilities. (B)	<p>The Proposed Project would reduce overcrowding and provide an expanded baggage screening area, which would also be enclosed to protect sensitive screening equipment. (PDF 3.7-1)</p> <p>Prior to the initiation of construction activities, the City's contractor shall prepare a Traffic Control Plan to ensure that adequate emergency access is maintained at the Airport during construction. As part of the Traffic Control Plan the contractor shall alert emergency and security service providers of the construction activities for each phase of construction. The Traffic Control Plan shall be submitted to the City Traffic Engineer for approval. (SC 3.7-1)</p>	

TABLE 2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Level Of Significance After Mitigation/Status Of The Mitigation Measure
	<p>During project design, the facility improvements shall adhere to TSA, FAA, and all applicable standards including City of Long Beach fire code, building code, and safety code. Long Beach Fire Department shall review and approve design plans as part of the site plan review and building permit processes. (SC 3.7-2)</p> <p>During construction activities, the relocation or modification of TSA facilities shall be coordinated with TSA to ensure that there is no compromise to the TSA function that would adversely affect TSA's ability to perform its passenger and baggage security screening activities. (SC 3.7-3)</p> <p>Prior to initiation of any modifications to the airfield side, the contractor shall provide a Construction Phasing Implementation Plan, meeting the approval of the Airport Manager. The Plan shall demonstrate how construction activities will be conducted and that all applicable FAA airfield safety requirements are being met. In addition, the contractor shall prepare a safety plan and participate in on-going weekly safety meetings during construction. (SC 3.7-4)</p>	
Traffic and Circulation		
<p>The Proposed Project provides an opportunity to improve existing and future conditions at the Airport. (NI)</p>	<p>A component of the Proposed Project is the provision of a new parking structure that would accommodate 4,000 vehicles. (PDF 3.8-1)</p> <p>The project would include the extension of the south side of the Donald Douglas Drive loop to exit onto Lakewood Boulevard, with eastbound right turn only to southbound access on to Lakewood Boulevard. (PDF 3.8-2)</p> <p>With the construction of the parking structure, existing surface parking would be displaced. To address potential parking demand during construction, Parcel O would be developed to serve parking demand not met by existing facilities. (PDF 3.8-3)</p> <p>As part of contract specification, the Airport shall require all construction trucks to access the Airport terminal area via the I-605 to I-405 and Lakewood Boulevard. Construction vehicles accessing Parcel O shall use this route and access the construction site off of Clark Avenue or Willow Street. (SC 3.8-1)</p>	<p>Beneficial.</p>

TABLE 3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES RELATED TO THE OPTIMIZED FLIGHTS SCENARIO

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Level Of Significance After Mitigation/Status Of The Mitigation Measure
Air Quality and Health Risk Assessment		
Incremental air quality emissions with the Optimized Flights scenario would exceed SCAQMD's PM ₁₀ concentration threshold due to associated GSE and vehicular traffic activity, contribute substantially to an existing air quality violation, and expose sensitive receptors to significant PM ₁₀ concentrations. (SI)	The mitigation program identified in Table 1.10-1 above would address these impacts.	Significant.
Incremental air quality emissions with the Optimized Flights scenario would exceed SCAQMD's thresholds of significance for CO and NO _x . (SI)	The mitigation program identified in Table 1.10-1 above would address these impacts.	Significant for NO _x ; less than significant for CO and VOC.
Noise		
Though the Proposed Project would not result in any project related noise impacts, there are sensitive land uses within the 65 CNEL contour under both existing and Optimized Flights scenario (NI).	Within 24 months of certification of the EIR, the Airport Manager shall develop a land use compatibility program addressing existing and future aviation noise levels. The program shall be an ongoing voluntary program that will provide noise attenuation and be available to all residential units within the 65 CNEL contour and schools within the 60 CNEL contour based on the contours published for Long Beach Airport for the previous calendar year (Quarterly Report for 12 month Period Ending December 31). In exchange for sound insulation treatment, the owners of the property will provide the City of Long Beach a noise easement over said property. The program shall identify (1) methods of providing noise attenuation; (2) funding sources for the improvements; (3) methods for establishing priorities for implementing the improvements; and (4) an installation agreement. The land use compatibility program will be administered by the City of Long Beach, Airport Bureau. (MM 3.6-2)	Beneficial.
Land Use and Relevant Planning		
The Optimized Flights scenario has the potential to induce airport land uses beyond the Airport boundary. Specifically, the increased flight levels would require additional vehicular parking beyond the levels provided by the Proposed Project. (SI)	Implementation of MM 3.8-2 requiring the addition of on-site parking in conjunction with allocation of additional flights would address these impacts.	Less than significant.

TABLE 3 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES RELATED TO THE OPTIMIZED FLIGHTS SCENARIO

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Level Of Significance After Mitigation/Status Of The Mitigation Measure
Transportation and Circulation		
The Existing Plus Optimized Flight Scenario would result in significant impacts at the Spring Street/Lakewood Boulevard and the Willow Street/Lakewood Boulevard intersections during the weekday AM peak hour. (SI)	In conjunction with the allocation of additional flights in accordance with the Airport Noise Compatibility Noise Ordinance when the ADPM passenger levels reach 12,700, the Airport Manager shall develop a traffic monitoring program. The traffic monitoring program shall evaluate the LOS at the Spring Street and Lakewood Boulevard and the Willow Street and Lakewood Boulevard intersections. (MM 3.8-1)	Less than significant.
With the Optimized Flights scenario, there would be insufficient parking at the Airport to accommodate the additional passenger levels. (SI)	In conjunction with the allocation of additional flights in accordance with the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance, when the annual passenger levels reach 4.2 MAP, the Airport Manager shall identify and develop additional on-site parking opportunities. (MM 3.8-2)	Less than significant.

TABLE 3 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES RELATED TO THE
OPTIMIZED FLIGHTS SCENARIO

Would the Proposed Project Yield Any Beneficial Impacts?

The Proposed Project would result in beneficial impacts to public services (TSA and Airport security) by providing enhanced facilities. Likewise, it would improve existing and future traffic conditions at the Airport by enhancing circulation and providing additional on-site parking.

In addition to reducing project-related impacts, the proposed mitigation program would yield long-term benefits at the Airport. Specifically:

- By ensuring that the Terminal Area improvements are designed and constructed to meet LEED specifications, the Airport would achieve greater energy efficiency.
- By providing the infrastructure to support operation of electric ground service equipment (GSE) and other on-Airport vehicles, aircraft emissions would be significantly reduced.
- The voluntary noise attenuation program recommended in the DEIR would provide beneficial impacts to residences within the 65 CNEL contour and schools within the 60 CNEL contour.

What Was Determined to Be the Environmentally Superior Alternative?

CEQA requires that the EIR identify the environmentally superior alternative. Each of the alternatives (including the Proposed Project) would provide additional capacity that would help serve the number of passengers served by the minimum number of flights provided for in the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance. However, based on the HNTB study (2004) conducted during the scoping process, the recommended sizes of the facilities to best meet the needs for the passengers, visitors, and tenants actually exceeded the square footage allocation of even the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project is able to meet all the project objectives, including complying with the parameters of the adopted Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance; maintaining the current character of the Airport Terminal Building as a Long Beach Cultural Heritage Landmark; and constructing an operationally and energy-efficient and value-driven design. The Proposed Project does not result in substantially greater impacts than the other build alternatives. Therefore, the Proposed Project is the environmentally superior alternative.

Does Certification of the EIR Signify Approval of the Proposed Project?

No. Certification of the EIR does not authorize design and construction of a project. It only provides the guidelines for moving forward on any of the projects identified in the EIR. The City Council would have to make a separate action to initiate the project. This action would include contracts for design, construction, and financing.

How Can You Provide Comments on the Proposed Project?

The public comment period is from Monday, November 7, 2005 to Thursday, December 22, 2005. All comments or other responses to the DEIR should be submitted in writing to: Angela Reynolds, Environmental Officer, City of Long Beach, Planning and Building Department, 333 West Ocean Boulevard, Long Beach, California 90802.

TABLE 3 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES RELATED TO THE
OPTIMIZED FLIGHTS SCENARIO

Comments can also be e-mailed to: AirportEIR@longbeach.gov.

If e-mail comments include attachments, the attachments should be delivered separately, in writing, and in person or by regular mail, to the address specified above. The virus protection measures of the City's e-mail system, as well as the variety of potential formats for attachments, limit the ability for attachments to be delivered by e-mail. The website includes directions on how to provide comments via e-mail.

It should also be noted that a transcript of verbal comments will be made at each of the public meetings. As with the comments submitted in writing, these comments will be responded to in writing as part of the Final EIR.